



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

omitted or modified these passages before he permitted the publication of the play.⁹

JOHN J. PARRY.

University of Illinois.

REVIEWS

The Ancient Cross Shafts at Bewcastle and Ruthwell. Enlarged from the Rede Lecture, delivered before the University of Cambridge on 20 May, 1916, by G. F. Browne. With three photogravures and twenty-three illustrations. Cambridge, University Press, 1916.

In this handsome quarto Bishop Browne reaffirms the general views concerning the date of the Bewcastle and Ruthwell Crosses which he has maintained with reasonable consistency since 1884,¹ when, following George Stephens in 1866 (*Date*, p. 8), he read "Cædmon made me" on the head of the Ruthwell Cross, and, following John Maughan in 1857,² thought that the Bewcastle Cross "was erected to King Alchfrith, in the first year of King Ecgrith, about A. D. 665."³ "Alchfrith," he went on to say, "was the patron of Wilfrith" (*Accounts*, pp. 83 ff.). In 1896 he wrote of the Bewcastle Cross: "It was set up in the year 670" (*Date*, p. 12). In 1890 he read on the Ruthwell Cross "Kedmon mæ fauœþo" (*Date*, p. 11), Stephens having read: "Cadmon mæ fauœþo," which he interpreted: "Cadmon me fawed (made)" (*Date*, pp. 8, 41); and in 1897 was confident that this cross was erected before the death of King Ecgrith in 685 (*Date*, p. 12),

⁹ There is considerable mystery surrounding the publication of this play, two editions of which, by different publishers, were licensed within two weeks of each other. I consider, however, that the alterations made in the earlier text show Randolph's hand clearly, so if Harper's edition was, as I suspect, a pirated one, it must have been printed from a copy which Randolph had revised with the idea of publication in mind.

¹ See my monograph, *The Date of the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses* (hereafter referred to as *Date*), p. 9.

² See my monograph, *Some Accounts of the Bewcastle Cross* (hereafter referred to as *Accounts*), pp. 71 ff., 96; Maughan had published something to the same effect in December, 1855 (*Accounts*, p. 136).

³ Maughan had said 670; Daniel H. Haigh, in 1856, said between 664 and 670 (*Accounts*, p. 136).

unless it had been brought, by sea according to tradition, from distant parts (p. 42; cf. his *Theodore and Wilfrith*, p. 236). He still adheres (p. 5) to the date of 670 for the Bewcastle Cross, while now inclined, if I understand him, to assume a somewhat later date for the Ruthwell Cross.

In 1890 (*Academy* XXXVII, 153-4) I joined issue with those who contended that the inscription on the Ruthwell Cross dates, in its present form, from the seventh century. This hypothesis I undertook to refute on linguistic grounds alone. In 1901 (*P. M. L. A.*, XVII, 380-390) I extended the linguistic proof, and adduced other considerations, drawn from the meaning, metre, and diction (*P. M. L. A.*, XVII, 375-380). In 1912 I added other arguments based upon the language of the decipherable runes on both the Ruthwell and the Bewcastle Crosses (*Date*, pp. 32-40, 42-44), and endeavored to confirm the resulting conclusions by considerations deduced from the figure-sculpture and the decorative sculpture on the two monuments (*Date*, pp. 45 ff.). In 1915 I showed, by a comparison of the two accounts written by the local archæologists, Haigh and Maughan, in 1857, that they were mutually contradictory in essential points as respects the Bewcastle Cross, and in fact virtually nullified each other (*Accounts*, pp. 36-122; cf. pp. 30, 141-4, and *Date*, plate opposite p. 41).

In 1890 I confined myself to the opinion that "the inscription on the Ruthwell Cross is at least as late as A. D. 950, . . . while certain indications . . . would point to a still later date." In 1901 I said (*P. M. L. A.*, XVII, 390): "We shall not hesitate, I believe, to assume that the Ruthwell inscription is at least as late as the tenth century." In 1912 I was led to the belief that "a date not far from 1150 would perhaps harmonize all the indications better than any other that could be named" (*Date*, p. 146), and more tentatively suggested (*Date*, pp. 147-9) that David I of Scotland might conceivably have been responsible for the erection of the two crosses.

So much it is necessary to premise, since Bishop Browne has done me the honor to make me one of the principal objects of his courteous attacks on those who do not agree with him in favoring the early date proposed by Maughan, Haigh, and Stephens.

Ignoring debatable matters, the issue is simply this: Were the two crosses erected in the seventh century, or in the twelfth? As the argument from language which I put forward in 1890 has

been, so far as I know, completely ignored by British archaeologists, and as I conceive it to be of capital importance, I revert to that, and will endeavor to restate it with as much clearness as I am able to attain.

The basis of such linguistic proof is to be found in the two sentences with which I began my paper of Feb. 1, 1890:

"If the date of an ancient inscribed monument is to be determined by the evidence of language alone, the procedure is manifestly the same as in the case of a manuscript. If we found a number of eleventh-century forms in a manuscript, then, though other forms might clearly belong to the sixth century, we should be warranted in dating the manuscript not earlier than the eleventh century."

To which may be added a subsequent statement:

"The occurrence of earlier forms, though in considerable number, does not invalidate such evidence of lateness as has been mentioned, since these earlier forms may have been introduced into a late copy either accidentally or intentionally, while it is impossible that late forms should have been introduced into an early document."

It is well understood that the course of the English language for the first few centuries may be traced by the changes which take place in the forms of words—among these being the losses and modifications experienced by their endings, and occasioned by the lack of stress. One of the commonest of these is the passage of the final vowels *a* and *u* into a neutral *e*, pronounced like the *a* in *vista*, the *e* afterwards becoming silent: thus OE. *mōna* becomes ME. *mone*, *moone*, and finally *moon*; *sunu* becomes *sune*, *sone*, and finally *son*. But the change which most concerns us here is the loss of final *n* in the endings of verbs, especially in the infinitive and the preterit plural. The infinitive *cuman* thus appears in Luke 18. 16 (MS. from about A. D. 1000): "*Lātað þā lýtlingas tō mē cuman.*" The MS. of about 1160 reads: "*Lāteð þā lýtlinges tō mē cumen.*" By Chaucer's time the infinitive appears as *come*: thus in *Book of the Duchess* 708: "For that is doon is not to *come*." However, the *-en* of 1160 still persists in Chaucer's time, and even sporadically for half a century later; thus, *Parl.* 75-6:

Thou shalt nat misse
To *comen* swiftly to that place dere.

But here it is important to observe that the Northumbrian dialect

of OE. loses the final *n* of the infinitive⁴ much earlier than Chaucer's time, and indeed earlier than in the earliest manuscript of the West Saxon Gospels, namely by 950-1000,⁵ the date of the Northumbrian Gospels in the Durham Book (see my *Glossary of the Old Northumbrian Gospels*, Halle, 1894). Thus in Lk. 18. 16 (see the West Saxon above) we have: "Lētas ðā enaihtes *cuma* tō mē." Here it is evident that the final *n* is already gone, more than four hundred years before the date of the *Canterbury Tales*. But the Northumbrian dialect had not always been without the final *n* of the infinitive. It occurs before 750 (*P. M. L. A.*, xvii, 381) in the *hergan* of *Cædmon's Hymn*,⁶

Nū scylun *hergan* hefænricæs Uard,

in the *haatan*⁷ (i. e. *hātan*) of the *Leiden Riddle*, and in the *cnyissan* (i. e. *cnyssan*) of the same,⁸ which exists in a manuscript of the ninth century. Down to some date in the ninth century, then, the final *n* of the infinitive continues to be found, but in Northumbrian is lost by some period between 950 and 1000.

But what is the bearing of all this upon the date of the Ruthwell Cross? Simply that all authorities⁹ agree that the only two infinitives that can be read on the cross, *gistiga* and *hælda*, end in *-a*, and not in *-an*. It follows at once that, by this test, the inscription can not be earlier than about the tenth century.

This is not all, however. There is a Northumbrian verbal form which is much more tenacious of its final *-n* than the infinitive—that is, the preterit plural. This typically ends in *-on* or *-un*, which, as in all the dialects, may become *-e* when followed by the subject-pronoun of the first and second persons (Sievers, § 360. 2). In the period to which the Lindisfarne Gospels belong, any other ending than *-on* or *-un* was so rare that Sievers, in the third edition of his *Grammatik* (1898) categorically denied (§ 364, note 4; cf. Bülbring, § 557. e) that any such existed. There are, how-

⁴ Cf. Sievers, *Grammar*, § 188. 2; Bülbring, *Elementarbuch*, § 557, a.

⁵ So Skeat, *St. John*, p. ix: "The latter half of the tenth century."

⁶ Sweet, *Oldest English Texts*, p. 149; Zupitza-Schipper, *Alt- und Mittel-englisches Übungsbuch*, p. 2.

⁷ Sweet, p. 151; Schlutter, *Anglia* xxxii, 387-8; xxxiii, 466.

⁸ Schlutter, as above; and see particularly *Anglia* xxxiii, 465.

⁹ So Zupitza-Schipper, *op. cit.*, pp. 6, 7; Grein-Wülker, *Bibl. der Aeg. Poesie*, ii, 114-5; J. R. Allen, *Early Christ. Mon. of Scotland*, iii, 445-8; Vietor, *Die Northumbrischen Runensteine*, p. 6.

ever, a very few sporadic forms in *-o*, in contrast with a vastly larger number of instances (354 of *wēron*, etc., the preterit plural of the verb *to be*, in the Gospels) of *-on*, *-un*. In other words, there is an overwhelming predominance in the Northumbrian of 950-1000 of *-on*, *-un* in the preterit plural of verbs, both strong and weak. Now how does it stand with the inscription on the Ruthwell Cross? Here there are five plural preterits; three of them end in *-un* (*ālegdun*, laid; *bihēaldun*, beheld; *gīstōddun*, stood), while two (*cwōmu*,¹⁰ came; *bismæradu*,¹¹ reviled) end in *-u*. In other words, 40 per cent. of the instances have the shorter form, and thus point to a later date than 950-1000.

Other linguistic considerations might be added here, but may be read at length in the pages cited above. Nothing could be

¹⁰ The West Saxon ms. of Matthew 25, 36 (ca. 1160) has: "Ge cōmen tō mē"; the Northumbrian: "Gie cuōmun tō mē." In 1048 the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle has *cōmon*, and in 1070 *cōmen* (Earle and Plummer, *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, pp. 174, 205). Forbes and Dickins (*Mod. Lang. Rev.*, x, 32) object that "it can not fairly be inferred from this that the Ruthwell forms are later than those of Lindisfarne, Ritual, etc., for the latter usually have *-on*, with the change of unaccented *u* to *o*, which took place apparently in all Anglo-Saxon dialects in the course of the ninth century, whereas the Ruthwell forms invariably [that is, in five cases] have *-u*." But we are expressly told by Lindelöf (*Die Südnorthumbrische Mundart des 10. Jahrhunderts*, § 209, p. 130) that the Rushworth Gospels (cf. Bülbring, § 24. b) have about 500 instances of *-un* to about 90 of *-on*. Moreover, though *-on* preponderates in the Lindisfarne Gospels, there is a not inconsiderable number of *-un*'s: thus *cuōmun* (*cwōm(m)un*), Matt. Introd., p. 5, lines 12, 13; 2. 1; 3. 7; 13. 4; 21. 1; 25. 39; 26. 55; 28. 11, 13; Mk. 3. 13; 6. 31 (ms. reading, as against Skeat); Jn. 6. 17 (like last); 7. 45; in the Rushworth Gospels *cōmun* occurs 43 times, *cōm(m)on*, 29.

¹¹ The ms. of ca. 1160 has *bysmeredon* in Matt. 25. 39, 41; *bismeredon* occurs in Lind. Matt. 27. 29, 31 (cf. 41); Mk. 15. 20; Lk. 22. 63; 23. 35; *bismæradun* in Rush. Mk. 15. 20; Lk. 22. 63; 23. 35, 36. As another mark of lateness in the inscription, I may instance the ending *-e* in *walde* (*Dream of the Rood* 41, *wolde*); the ancient ending was *-æ*, as is shown by the *āstelidæ*, *tiadæ* of *Cædmon's Hymn* (cf. Sievers, *Grammar*, § 44, note 1). Forbes and Dickins (*Mod. Lang. Rev.*, x, 29) object that the final *e* is marked as doubtful by Vietor. What he says is (*North. Runensteine*, p. 7) that the last stroke of the four constituting the letter (resembling M) is lacking; and my photograph (*Date*, Fig. 16, end of 13th line on right) shows that this is true; but the most recent critical edition of the Ruthwell runes (Zupitza-Schipper) accepts this reading (p. 3, l. 2, end of third word; p. 6).

clearer, however, than the conclusions to which the facts just adduced point. They are not decisive with respect to the twelfth century, but they seem to me convincing with respect to the seventh.

It is hardly necessary to repeat, at this date, that the inscription on the Ruthwell Cross is extracted, or adapted, from the *Dream of the Rood*. This, which has been called by Dr. Henry Bradley "the noblest example of Old English religious poetry," was first definitely attributed to Cynewulf by Dietrich in 1865 (see my edition, p. xvii). After weighing the arguments and counter-arguments, I expressed in 1905 (my edition, p. xl) the opinion that "the balance of probability seems to incline decidedly in favor of Cynewulfian authorship." Bishop Browne, following Haigh (my edition, p. xi; *Date*, p. 7) and Stephens (my edition, pp. xii-xiv; *Date*, p. 8), who had attributed the whole poem to Cædmon, assigns (p. 68) to him "the earlier and finer half of this great poem," down to line 64—a portion, be it noted, which contains all the passages drawn upon for the inscription on the cross, except (what he has overlooked) the phrase "fore (allæ) men," which occurs, as "for ealle men," in line 93 (cf. *P. M. L. A.*, xvii, 378).

What shall we say, then, to this ascription to Cædmon of the whole, or a part, of the *Dream of the Rood*, supported (pp. 68-71), as it is, by the statement that the head of the cross bears the runic *Kedmon mæ fauœƿa*? This reading, in the first place, is not confirmed by Vietor (*op. cit.*, p. 11), who doubtfully discerns: :(R?) D (D?) Æ ƿ (:) (MÆ?) (F) A Y R ƿ O, out of which nothing can be made.¹² "But," as Sweet said in 1885, "assuming the name Cædmon, it can only be taken as that of the sculptor who devised the ornamentation and carved the cross." We have seen the date assigned by Bishop Browne to the Ruthwell Cross. How does it accord with the hypothesis that the lines upon it were written by Cædmon? Of the latter Dr. Henry Bradley has said:¹³ "It is commonly stated that he died in 680, in the same year as

¹² Dr. Henry Bradley says (*Encyc. Brit.*, 11th edition, iv, 935, note 2): "Stephens read the inscription on the top-stone as *Cadmon mæ fauœƿo*, which he rendered 'Cadmon made me.' But these words are mere jargon, not belonging to any known or possible Old English dialect."

¹³ *Encyc. Brit.*, 11th edition, iv, 934; cf. Plummer's edition of Bede, II, 251.

the abbess Hild, but for this there is no authority. All that we know of his date is that his dream took place during the period (658-680) in which Hild was abbess of Streanæshalch, and that he must have died some considerable time before Bæda finished his history in 731." It may be added that the manuscript of his only ascertained poem, the brief *Cædmon's Hymn*, is probably rather later than 737,¹⁴ while that of *Bede's Death-Song* occurs in a St. Gall manuscript of the ninth century.¹⁵ We have nothing, then, of an earlier date than about 737 that represents Cædmon's authentic composition. This brief poem may have been produced at any time before Nov. 17, 680 (when Hild died), and his own death may have occurred at any time before (say) 710 (or even later). Such being the case, is it likely that some time before 685 (see above, p. 354) a great cross was erected about 112 miles northwest of Whitby, in a wild and desolate region of the Scotch border, bearing fragments of a poem composed by Cædmon (who, so far as we know, never was able to write, or even read), a humble herdsman who had become a humble monk? And who should have done it? Wilfrith? But about 685 he seems to have been occupied with quite other matters than the arts, his palmy era as a church-builder being placed by Bishop Browne¹⁶ "about 670 or 671" (cf. *Date*, p. 76, note 2), when he was sufficiently employed elsewhere (cf. Plummer II, 678).

But what as to the assignment of the Bewcastle Cross to the seventh century? Here, as in the case of the Ruthwell Cross, we must limit ourselves, in order to avoid undue prolixity, to one or two considerations. Take the chequers. In 1906, in a new and revised edition of his *Conversion of the Heptarchy* (p. 194), Bishop Browne called them "perhaps the most difficult thing to explain on the whole cross, whether as to purpose or as to date." No wonder that he found them so, seeing that the distinguished archæologist, Rivoira, expressly states that the earliest instance of

¹⁴ Plummer I, p. lxxxix; II, 251.

¹⁵ Plummer I, p. lxxii, note 1.

¹⁶ P. 18. Bishop Browne, who is inclined to associate Wilfrith with Bewcastle especially (p. 17; cf. p. 22, and his *Theodore and Wilfrith*, p. 37), seems not to be quite sure whether the Bewcastle and the Ruthwell crosses were done by the same hands or not. On p. 7 he speaks of "the skilled mason who carved the vine scrolls at Bewcastle and Ruthwell"; on p. 27 he doubts "if the artist was the same for the two crosses"; cf. pp. 43 ff., especially p. 47.

the chequer-pattern in ecclesiastical architecture is to be found in the abbey-church of Jumièges¹⁷ (1040-1066). This Bishop Browne now disposes of by saying (p. 37): "Chequers are an attractive ornament on a small shrine of wood or metal. . . . An Irish shrine thus adorned is in existence. The effect is admirably reproduced on the Bewcastle shaft."

After discussing the word *Cynnburug* on the Bewcastle Cross (*Date*, pp. 43-4), I ended thus: "Both *cynn*- and *burug* are comparatively late forms, which do not flourish till the 10th century, and persist long after that." This is waved aside with the remark (p. 77; cf. p. 15): "Enough has been said already about these confident assertions based on the assumption that philological accuracy was achieved by the designers or sculptors of these ancient monuments."

Bishop Browne's book abounds in digressions, and in many parts is characterized by vagueness. He leans much upon the testimony of early, or supposedly early, ivories, medallions, and such small objects. He too often transgresses what I believe to be cardinal principles in arriving at a just decision concerning the points at issue. One of these, which I had occasion to formulate a couple of years ago (*Jour. Eng. and Germ. Phil.*, xiv, 305 f.), I venture to reproduce here:

"So far as the archæological element is concerned, these crosses must be dated by ecclesiastical stone-sculpture whose approximate period is beyond reasonable doubt. They must be dated by stone-sculpture, because the minor arts, with which comparison has frequently been made, flourished before the age of mediæval stone-sculpture in northwestern Europe; and since the crosses, taken together, are predominantly ecclesiastical, they should be considered in relation to approximately contemporary specimens of that class. It is not sufficient to show that forms resembling these are to be found at a given period on ivories or in manuscripts, or incised in wood."

Bishop Browne's mode of procedure may be illustrated by a few details.

He defends Maughan's reading of *ean kynning*—understood as "one king" (*Accounts*, p. 72)—on the quite illegible part of the Bewcastle inscription, and defends it by saying (p. 76): "*Ean* is merely phonetic. It has never changed its sound in Northum-

¹⁷ *Lomb. Arch.*, II, 83; cf. *Date*, p. 85.

bria"—and that sound, he says, is *yan*. Yet he needed only to look at the *NED*. under *one* to discover that this Northern pronunciation did not originate until the latter part of the seventeenth century.

He goes back (pp. 22, 49, 61) to the notion that Wilfrith brought foreign artists to England, apparently from Italy, "with their portfolios full of the choicest patterns of panels in wood and stone and ivory." He seems not to have read with attention my long note (*Date*, pp. 76-7), in which I show that Eddi, Wilfrith's contemporary biographer, says nothing of his bringing artists *from abroad*, and that the statements to that effect were all invented by William of Malmesbury and others who lived four hundred years later, and who could have had no information on the subject save what they obtained from Eddi; yet on another point Bishop Browne remarks (p. 87): "When we look more closely into the position of Eddi and Bede, it seems rather absurd to reject them in favour of William of Malmesbury."

Apropos of my remark (*Date*, p. 53) that the crucifixion "is rarely figured in sculpture in the 10th century, and does not become at all common till the 13th," he observes (p. 29): "It would be idle to dwell upon that argument: Ruthwell and Bewcastle attract us because they are uniquely uncommon."

He discusses the Brussels Cross inscription, assigning it to a date before 982 (p. 72), being apparently unacquainted with my article in the *Modern Language Review* (Cambridge) for April, 1915, in which I endeavored to show the probability of its having been made toward 1050.

He remarks (p. 40):

"I have not seen anything that can be called an attempt to explain why David . . . should cover his monuments with Anglian runes, which were no longer the script of the English. . . . If it was done by him as a compliment to the English people who might see the crosses, I fear that archæology had not in that age come sufficiently into its own to make the compliment strike home."

He has apparently not read my paper in the *Scottish Historical Review* for July, 1914, where I said:

"That a writer of the early thirteenth century was familiar with the idea of runic monuments is clear from a passage in Layamon's *Brut* (ca. 1205), where he describes a stone erected to commemorate the victory of a mythical British king, Marius, over an equally mythi-

cal Pictish king, Rodric, as carved with 'strange runic letters' (*sælcuðe runstaven*). The same word for runic letters had been used three times in Old English poetry, in its plural form *rūnstafas*. . . . Considering his extensive journeys through England (27-8), it is tempting to conjecture that the then recent erection of our two runic crosses on the Border, each within twenty-five or thirty miles of Westmorland [where Geoffrey of Monmouth places the stone], suggested the traditional old term to Layamon."

Just as little does he seem acquainted with my article in the same periodical for January, 1915, entitled "Archaic English in the Twelfth Century," where I quoted Professor Earle (d. 1903), of Oxford, commenting on the "recondite scholarship" displayed in a certain group of charters of that period:

"[This group] belongs to the latter end of the 12th century. Though varying much in quality, it may be characterized generally as exhibiting a scholastic attention to the ancient forms of the language. The study of old models is sometimes overdone. . . The whole effect of the book is to impress us with the idea (which other writings support) of an Anglosaxon Renaissance at the close of the twelfth century."

I added:

"One of these charters, . . . purporting to date from about 856-8, . . . has been thus characterized by Kemble . . . : 'It bears marks of forgery in every line.'"

From the first I have tried to make it clear that the acceptance of a late epoch for a monument and its inscription did not necessarily imply a belief that the inscription was, as a whole, invented at such late epoch. Thus in 1912, not to quote earlier remarks, I referred (*Date*, p. 30) to the famous Columna Rostrata; but as my critics have not applied the natural inference from this example to the two Northern crosses, it may not be superfluous to enter into greater detail concerning the Latin inscription referred to. The Columna Rostrata was erected in the Roman Forum on the return of Gaius Duilius to Rome in 260 B. C., in honor of his naval victory—the first ever gained by the Romans—over the Carthaginians. The inscription, which was recovered in 1565, is not the original, but "has been preserved in a restored form in pseudo-archaic language, ascribed to the reign of Claudius"¹⁸ [A. D. 41-54]. "The shape of the letters plainly shows that the inscription,

¹⁸ *Encyc. Brit.* VIII, 650.

as we have it, was cut in the time of the empire. Hence Ritschl and Mommsen pointed out that the language was modified at the same time, and that, although many archaisms have been retained, some were falsely introduced, and others replaced by more modern forms. The most noteworthy features in it are—C always written for G (CESET = *gessit*), etc. . . . [This] is probably an affected archaism, G having been introduced some time before the assumed date of the inscription . . . The doubts hence arising preclude the possibility of using it with confidence as evidence for the state of the language in the 3rd century B. C." (*Encyc. Brit.* xvi, 251). In this connection I quoted (*Date*, p. 31) the words of Wimmer, the first authority in the world on runes: "The oldest forms of runes occur not infrequently on the latest monuments." I also quoted: "It appears certain that in Ogamic writing stereotyped forms were used long after they had disappeared in ordinary speech" (*Encyc. Brit.* v, 614). And again I said (*Date*, p. 32): "Henry Rousseau tells of certain sepulchral slabs in Belgium which bear inscriptions evidently copied from earlier ones." In 1914 I suggested (*Accounts*, pp. 132-3), with regard to the cross-head found at Bewcastle in 1615, but since lost:

"Why may we not assume that this was the head of an older cross [than the present Bewcastle Cross], of quite different shape, fallen, perhaps overthrown and covered with earth, and with some of the letters illegible? Might not such an older cross have been removed when the newer, and perhaps more highly ornamented one, was erected? In thus superseding the older one, the sculptor of the present cross might or might not have adapted the work of his predecessor. If so, an older *Cyniburg* might in this way have become *Cynnburug*."

Thus I have steadily borne in mind the possibility that earlier copies may have lain before the sculptor or designer of the inscriptions on our present crosses.

Let us see how this applies to the poetic extracts on the Ruthwell Cross. We do not certainly know who wrote the *Dream of the Rood*, not even whether he wrote in Northumbrian or some more southern dialect. But the inscription on the cross is at least mainly Northumbrian.¹⁹ Hence, unless the poem was first written in

¹⁹ It seems impossible to escape the conclusion that *dorstæ* stands on the cross (Zupitza-Schipper, p. 4, textual note on 39; Vietor, p. 6, col. 1, and *Anglia*, *Beiblatt* xxvi, 4), which in the Northumbrian would be *darstæ*

Northumbrian, it must have been rendered into that dialect before it was used by the maker of the cross. If it was written by Cynewulf, as there seems good reason to believe,²⁰ it was presumably at a period early enough to account for the archaic forms on the cross, supposing that the original was in Northumbrian, or that the original was turned into Northumbrian within a brief period. If not by Cynewulf, let it be by an unknown X,²¹ provided he were contemporary, or earlier.²² Then, as the direct original to which the phrases of our present inscription are due, we may posit either (1) an earlier lapidary inscription, based upon the poem, (2) an early manuscript copy of the poem, somewhat modernized in the transfer to stone, or (3) a later manuscript copy of the poem. In either case the present inscription—infelicities, modernized forms, and all—is sufficiently accounted for. Another adaptation

(cf. Lind. Mk. 12. 34; Jn. 21. 12; Lk. 20. 40). The *Dream of the Rood* has *dorste* (35, 42, 45, 47). Forbes and Dickins (*Mod. Lang. Rev.* x, 33) think that *darstæ* is not a sign of the Northumbrian dialect, but is a late analogical formation. Why, then, is such an analogical formation peculiar to Northumbrian, if it is not a matter of dialect? And if it is a matter of dialect, why may not the analogical influence have occurred at an early period? Compare the North. *walde*, for West Saxon *wolde*; *dēdon*, Lind. Matt. 26. 4, 19; 28. 15; Mk. 3. 6; Lk. 9. 15; Jn. 6. 23, etc., for *dydon*; *ēade*, Lind. Matt. 9. 7; 12. 45; Mk. 5. 2, etc., for *ēode*; and note, as early as *Cædmon's Hymn*, the peculiar *scylun*, for *sculun* (Sievers, *Gram.*, § 423. 8, note 1), which seems an analogical formation from the optative (occurring as *scyle(n)* 56 times in the Hatton ms. of Alfred's *Pastoral Care*, according to Cosijn, *Altwestsächsische Grammatik*, I, 78).

²⁰ See my edition of the *Dream of the Rood*, pp. xl-xli.

²¹ Only not by Cædmon, for reasons which will be apparent to any one possessing a sense of style, and who has attentively compared the *Dream of the Rood* with Bede's account of the herdsman.

²² Cf. Brandl's remark in Paul's *Grundriss*, II, 1, 1036 (cf. 1030): "Es ergibt sich demnach für die zwei Menschenalter, die ungefähr zwischen Cædmon und Cynewulf verstrichen, eine beträchtliche Ausbeute geistlicher Lyrik, inhaltlich durchaus von kirchlich-lateinischen Vorbildern bedingt, formell noch mit einiger Nachwirkung bodenständig-weltlicher Lyrik." ("We may therefore assume a considerable output of religious lyrics for the two generations, or thereabouts, lying between Cædmon and Cynewulf, dependent for their matter upon prototypes in ecclesiastical Latin, and exhibiting in their form some traces of the native secular lyric.") On p. 1030 he places the *Dream of the Rood* "vor die Mitte des achten Jahrhunderts." Of Northumbrian he says (*Scott. Hist. Rev.* IX, 140): "This particular dialect did retain for an astonishing length of time a whole series of sounds and inflexions which the others had long since abandoned."

of this general sort, though varying much more widely from its original in the collocation of phrases, is that on the Brussels cross, or reliquary, which, as indicated above, I date ca. 1040-50, and which runs:

Rōd is mīn nama; geō ic rīcne Cyning
 Bær byfigynde, blōde bestēmed.²³
 ("Rood is my name. Once long ago I bore
 Trembling, bedewed with blood, the mighty King.")

It, too, bears a sign of its late date—the word "byfigynde."

We have been chiefly concerned with the reasons which seem decisive against a seventh-century date for the crosses; the assignment of them to the twelfth century involves a variety of considerations which there is no space here to present in detail; they may be found in my book on the date, and are corroborated, it will be remembered, by the highly qualified archæological expert, Rivoira, who said ²⁴ in 1912: "The age of the Bewcastle Cross, if I am not mistaken, is not earlier than about the first half of the twelfth century. And the same is true of the other well-known cross at Ruthwell."

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

An Italian Reader of Nineteenth Century Literature. By THOMAS D. BERGEN and GEORGE B. WESTON. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1915.

The manuscript of this Reader was left in an incomplete condition by the death of the compiler, Th. D. Bergen, and the work of completion and revision was entrusted to Mr. George B. Weston, of Harvard University.

The book was designed to be a beginners' reader, and the extracts were chosen with a view to giving the student a first-hand knowledge of the modern literary idiom, a wide variety of topics, and a large number of individual styles. The authors represented and the number of extracts from each are as follows: De Amicis (2 extracts); De Sanctis (1); A. Poerio (2); Fucini (3); Grossi

²³ Cf. *Dream of the Rood*, 44, 42, 48.

²⁴ *Burlington Magazine*, April 15, 1912, p. 24; cf. his *Lombardic Architecture* (1910) II, 143.